

Verne, B. Michael

From:

Sent:

Thursday, September 19, 2013 11:19 AM

To:

Verne, B. Michael; Walsh, Kathryn

Cc:

Subject:

RE: HSR Question -- UPE

Yes. Meant to say Class 1 and 2. Also, yes, Class 1 and Class 2 vote separately for the election of directors and not as a single class. My first thought was yours. However, under 801.1(b). the LLC would not seem to be the UPE because it does not control Company B. While it elects 5 of the 9 directors, it only holds approximately 46% of the outstanding voting securities. Thoughts?

From: Verne, B. Michael [mailto:MVERNE@ftc.gov] **Sent:** Thursday, September 19, 2013 11:09 AM

To:

Walsh, Kathryn

Cc:

Subject: RE: HSR Question -- UPE

Still somewhat confusing. We are assuming in the second table you mean Class 1 & Class 2, not Class A & Class B. We are also assuming that, despite the parenthetical, Class 1 and Class 2 vote separately for the election of directors, not together as a single class. If those assumptions are correct, then why isn't the LLC that holds all of the Class 1 stock the UPE? It can elect 5 of 9 directors on its own. What are we missing?

From:

Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 10:52 AM

To: Walsh, Kathryn; Verne, B. Michael

Cc:

Subject: RE: HSR Question -- UPE

Mike:

To clarify the parentheticals in #4 and #6 below, Class 1 and Class 2 stock is all common stock. Thus from a total outstanding common stock perspective, Class 1 represents approximately 46% of the common stock and Class 2 represents approximately 54% of the common stock as follows:

l .	Class 1 Common	Common	Percentage of Total Class 1 & Class 2 Common Stock
Issued and Outstanding Class 1 Shares		35,288,762	46.18%
Issued and Outstanding Class 2 Shares	41,120,128		53.82%

Shares of Class 1 and Class 2	Percentage of
-------------------------------	---------------

7

		Total Class A & Class B Common Stock
Issued and Outstanding Class A & B Shares:	76,408,890	100%

One other wrinkle, Class 2 common stock is called non-voting because the holder has no voting rights other than the election to Company B's board of 4 of the 9 board directors. In other words with respect to the merger, the members that they elected to Company B's board voted for the transaction but the actual holders of Class 2 common stock did not get to participate in the shareholders' vote for the transaction. In contrast, in addition to having the right to elect 5 of the 9 directors to Company B's board, the holders of class 1 common stock got to participate in the shareholder vote for the transaction.

While this is a wrinkle, under 801.1(f)(1)(i)'s definition of a voting security, the Class 2 common stock would seem to be a "voting security" given that it "entitle[s] the owner or holder thereof to vote for the election of directors of the issuer even though it called non-voting Class 2 common stock by Company B.

Because I have never run into this fact pattern before, I wanted to run it by you to get your views.

Best,

From:

Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2013 9:48 AM

To: 'Walsh, Kathryn (<u>kwalsh@ftc.gov</u>)'; 'mverne@ftc.gov'

Cc:

Subject: RE: HSR Question -- UPE

Mike and Kate:

I hope all is well. I would like to run something by you in connection with determining the UPE of my client (the seller in a merger transaction).

Here are the facts:

- 1. Merger between Company A and Company B (the target).
- 2. Company B is a corporate entity.
- 3. There are two classes of Company B common stock.
- 4. Class 1 stock represents 46% of all common stock (Classes 1 and 2 combined).
- 5. Class 1 stock entitles the holders to vote for 5 of the 9 directors for Company B.
- 6. Class 2 stock represents 54% of all common stock (Classes 1 and 2 combined)
- 7. Class 2 stock entitles the holders to vote for 4 of the 9 directors for Company B.
- 8. Class 1 stock is held by an LLC, which in turn is controlled by a Fund.
- Class 2 stock is held by individuals investors with the largest investor holding 12.5% of the Class 2 stock.

Analysis

Because Classes 1 and 2 stock each have the right to vote for directors they are voting securities under 801.(f)(1)(i) of the HSR rules. However, Company B is its own UPE because no person holds 50% or more of the outstanding voting securities of Company B.

Appreciate your thoughts.

Best,



Confidentiality Notice:

This message is being sent by or on behalf of a lawyer. It is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure. If you are not the named addressee, you are not authorized to read, print, retain, copy or disseminate this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete all copies of the message.

Because applying the formula in § 801.12, LLC holds 55.56%, not 46.18%.

§ 801.12(b) requires calculations of the percentage of voting securities held to be made according to the following formula:

Number of votes of class A held divided by Total votes of class A times Directors elected by class A stock divided by Total number of directors.

Χ

In your case, calculating the percentage of voting securities held by LLC:

35,288,762 (Class 1votes held by LLC)

5 (Number of directors elected by Class 1)

= 55.56%

35,288,762 (Total Class 1 votes)

9 (Total number of directors)

KW CONCURS